

1 Joseph Clapp, Esq., SBN 99194  
2 AIMA-SMITH & MARCY  
3 7677 Oakport Street, Suite 1150  
4 Oakland, CA 94621  
5 Telephone: (510) 590-7115/Facsimile: (510) 562-6830  
6 Email: [jc@asmlawyers.com](mailto:jc@asmlawyers.com)

7 Ronald A. Marron, Esq.  
8 Michael T. Houchin, Esq.  
9 Lilach Halperin, Esq.  
10 Kas L. Gallucci, Esq.  
11 LAW OFFICES OF RONALD A. MARRON, APLC  
12 651 Arroyo Drive  
13 San Diego, CA 92103  
14 Telephone: (619) 696-9006/Facsimile: (619) 564-6665  
15 Email: [ron@consumersadvocates.com](mailto:ron@consumersadvocates.com)  
16 Email: [michael@consumersadvocates.com](mailto:michael@consumersadvocates.com)  
17 Email: [lilach@consumersadvocates.com](mailto:lilach@consumersadvocates.com)  
18 Email: [kas@consumersadvocates.com](mailto:kas@consumersadvocates.com)

19 Timothy D. Cohelan, Esq., SBN 60827  
20 Isam C. Khoury, Esq., SBN 58759  
21 J. Jason Hill, Esq., SBN 179630  
22 COHELAN KHOURY & SINGER  
23 605 C Street, Suite 200  
24 San Diego, California 92101  
25 Telephone: (619) 595-3001/Facsimile: (619) 595-3000  
26 Email: [tcohelan@ckslaw.com](mailto:tcohelan@ckslaw.com)  
27 Email: [jkhoury@ckslaw.com](mailto:jkhoury@ckslaw.com)  
28 Email: [jhill@ckslaw.com](mailto:jhill@ckslaw.com)

Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Putative Class

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHELLE HINDS, an individual, and TYRONE ) Case No.: 4:18-cv-01431-JSW  
(AGT) POWELL, an individual, )

Plaintiffs, )

vs. )

FEDEX GROUND PACKAGE SYSTEM, INC., )  
corporation; BAY RIM SERVICES, INC., a )  
corporation; and Does 1 through 25, inclusive, )

Defendants. )

**Plaintiffs' Excerpts of Admissions, With  
Objections and Responses**

Judge: Honorable Jeffrey S. White  
Department: 5

1 Pursuant to paragraph 2(g) of the Final Pretrial Conference Procedures and Required Filings,  
2 Plaintiffs submit the following requests for admission that are to be used in their case in chief, along  
3 with the objections of Defendant FedEx Ground and Plaintiffs' responses.

4  
5 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 22:**

6 During the period from March 5, 2014 to the present, FXG did not authorize rest periods for  
7 pick-up and delivery drivers employed by Independent Service Providers in California.

8 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 22:**

9 FedEx Ground objects to this request as stated in Objection Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4. Subject to,  
10 limited by, and without waiving such objections, FedEx Ground responds as follows:

11 **FedEx Ground admits that, during the Operative Period, it has not employed any**  
12 **pickup and delivery drivers that were employed by SPs in California. Accordingly, FedEx**  
13 **Ground has not undertaken any of the types of actions (such as establishing rest period**  
14 **schedules, publishing its own rest period policies and procedures, or providing training or**  
15 **instruction regarding rest periods) that FedEx Ground understands Plaintiffs contend would**  
16 **be examples of actions that may be necessary for an employer to comply with its obligations**  
17 **under Section 12 of Wage Order No. 9-2001 of the California Industrial Welfare Commission.**

18 **The SPs that employed the drivers were, however, at all times during the Operative**  
19 **Period, required as stated in the SPs' written agreements with FedEx Ground, to comply with**  
20 **all California laws and regulations applicable to the SPs' employment of such drivers.**  
21 **Accordingly, FedEx Ground denies that the drivers were not authorized to take rest periods as**  
22 **required by California law. Other than as expressly admitted above, FedEx Ground denies this**  
23 **request.**

24 **OBJECTION:**

25 Federal Rules of Evidence 402 and 403. This request and response relate to this case as a  
26 putative class action before the Court's denial of certification. What FedEx Ground did or did not do  
27 with respect to all "pick-up and delivery drivers employed by Independent Service Providers in  
28 California" during the period 2014 to present is not relevant to any issue in this case. Also, Plaintiffs'

1 use of the request and response would be unfairly prejudicial and confusing to jurors because it  
2 indicate this is a larger or class action, and it is not. Additionally, whether FedEx Ground itself  
3 “authorize[d] rest periods” for Service Providers’ employees across the State of California is not  
4 relevant to Plaintiffs’ proofs, and it is prejudicial and confusing because it puts before the jury an  
5 issue that is not pertinent to their decision (i.e., potential implications of FedEx Ground being a “bad  
6 actor” for not authorizing such breaks itself when the real question is whether Bay Rim authorized  
7 breaks for its drivers). This Court has thrice rejected Plaintiffs’ proposal to prove meal and rest break  
8 violations based on FedEx Ground’s conduct divorced from Service Providers’ practices. (*See* Order  
9 Denying Mot. for Class Cert. 15-16, ECF No. 171; Order on Def. FedEx Ground Package Sys., Inc.’s  
10 Mot. to Strike 7-8, ECF No. 184; Order Granting Mot. to Strike PAGA Claim Asserted Against Def.  
11 FedEx Ground Package Sys., Inc. 4-5, ECF No. 201.)

12 **RESPONSE TO OBJECTION:**

13 If FedEx Ground is an employer, it must authorize and permit rest periods. IWC Wage Order  
14 9(12). This admission makes clear that FedEx Ground did not do anything to comply with this  
15 obligation other than insert a clause in its standard ISP Agreement stating that ISPs should follow the  
16 law.

17  
18 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 23:**

19 During the period from March 5, 2014 to the present, FXG did not maintain any policy  
20 authorizing rest periods for pick-up and delivery drivers employed by Independent Service Providers  
21 in California.

22 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 23:**

23 FedEx Ground objects to this request as stated in Objection Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4. Subject to,  
24 limited by, and without waiving such objections, FedEx Ground responds as follows:

25 **For purposes of this response, the phrase "rest periods" refers to rest periods pursuant to**  
26 **Section 12 of Wage Order No. 9-2001 of the California Industrial Welfare Commission.**

1       FedEx Ground admits that, during the Operative Period, it has not employed any  
2 pickup and delivery drivers that were employed by SPs in California. Accordingly, FedEx  
3 Ground has not established or published rest period policies of its own that applied to drivers.

4       The SPs that employed the drivers were, however, at all times during the Operative  
5 Period, required as stated in the SPs' written agreements with FedEx Ground, to comply with  
6 all California laws and regulations applicable to the SPs' employment of such drivers.  
7 Accordingly, FedEx Ground denies that the drivers were not authorized to take rest periods as  
8 required by California law.

9       Other than as expressly admitted above, FedEx Ground denies this request.

10 **OBJECTION:**

11       Federal Rules of Evidence 402 and 403. This request and response relate to this case as a  
12 putative class action before the Court's denial of certification. What FedEx Ground did or did not do  
13 with respect to all "pick-up and delivery drivers employed by Independent Service Providers in  
14 California" during the period 2014 to present is not relevant to any issue in this case. Also, Plaintiffs'  
15 use of the request and response would be unfairly prejudicial and confusing to jurors because it  
16 indicate this is a larger or class action, and it is not. Additionally, whether FedEx Ground itself did  
17 not "maintain any policy authorizing rest periods" for Service Providers' employees across the State  
18 of California is not relevant to Plaintiffs' proofs, and it is prejudicial and confusing because it puts  
19 before the jury an issue that is not pertinent to their decision (i.e., potential implications of FedEx  
20 Ground being a "bad actor" for not authorizing such breaks itself when the real question is whether  
21 Bay Rim authorized breaks for its drivers). This Court has thrice rejected Plaintiffs' proposal to prove  
22 meal and rest break violations based on FedEx Ground's conduct divorced from Service Providers'  
23 practices. (See Order Denying Mot. for Class Cert. 15-16, ECF No. 171; Order on Def. FedEx  
24 Ground Package Sys., Inc.'s Mot. to Strike 7-8, ECF No. 184; Order Granting Mot. to Strike PAGA  
25 Claim Asserted Against Def. FedEx Ground Package Sys., Inc. 4-5, ECF No. 201.)

26 **RESPONSE TO OBJECTION:**

27       If FedEx Ground is an employer, it must authorize and permit rest periods. IWC Wage Order  
28 9(12). This admission makes clear that FedEx Ground did not do anything to comply with this

1 obligation other than insert a clause in its standard ISP Agreement stating that ISPs should follow the  
2 law.

3  
4 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 24:**

5 During the period from March 5, 2014 to the present, FXG did not compensate pick-up and  
6 delivery drivers employed by Independent Service Providers in California for the drivers' rest period  
7 time.

8 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 24:**

9 FedEx Ground objects to this request as stated in Objection Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4. Subject to,  
10 limited by, and without waiving such objections, FedEx Ground responds as follows:

11 **For purposes of this response, the phrase "rest periods" refers to rest periods pursuant**  
12 **to Section 12 of Wage Order No. 9-2001 of the California Industrial Welfare Commission.**

13 **FedEx Ground admits that, during the Operative Period, it has not employed any**  
14 **pickup and delivery drivers that were employed by SPs in California. Accordingly, FedEx**  
15 **Ground has not compensated drivers at all, including for rest periods.**

16 **The SPs that employed the drivers were, however, at all times during the Operative**  
17 **Period, required as stated in the SPs' written agreements with FedEx Ground, to compensate**  
18 **drivers in accordance with all California laws and regulations applicable to the SPs'**  
19 **employment of such drivers. Accordingly, FedEx Ground denies that the drivers were not**  
20 **compensated for rest period time to the extent required by California law.**

21 **Other than as expressly admitted above, FedEx Ground denies this request.**

22 **OBJECTION:**

23 Federal Rules of Evidence 402 and 403. This request and response relate to this case as a  
24 putative class action before the Court's denial of certification. What FedEx Ground did or did not do  
25 with respect to all "pick-up and delivery drivers employed by Independent Service Providers in  
26 California" during the period 2014 to present is not relevant to any issue in this case. Also, Plaintiffs'  
27 use of the request and response would be unfairly prejudicial and confusing to jurors because it  
28 indicate this is a larger or class action, and it is not. Additionally, whether FedEx Ground itself paid

1 “for the drivers’ rest period time” for Service Providers’ employees across the State of California is  
2 not relevant to Plaintiffs’ proofs, and it is prejudicial and confusing because it puts before the jury an  
3 issue that is not pertinent to their decision (i.e., potential implications of FedEx Ground being a “bad  
4 actor” for not authorizing such breaks itself when the real question is whether Bay Rim authorized  
5 breaks for its drivers). This Court has thrice rejected Plaintiffs’ proposal to prove meal and rest break  
6 violations based on FedEx Ground’s conduct divorced from Service Providers’ practices. (*See* Order  
7 Denying Mot. for Class Cert. 15-16, ECF No. 171; Order on Def. FedEx Ground Package Sys., Inc.’s  
8 Mot. to Strike 7-8, ECF No. 184; Order Granting Mot. to Strike PAGA Claim Asserted Against Def.  
9 FedEx Ground Package Sys., Inc. 4-5, ECF No. 201.)

10 **RESPONSE TO OBJECTION:**

11 If FedEx Ground is an employer, it must authorize and permit rest periods and must pay for  
12 rest period time. IWC Wage Order 9(12). This admission makes clear that FedEx Ground did not do  
13 anything to comply with these obligations other than insert a clause in its standard ISP Agreement  
14 stating that ISPs should follow the law.

15  
16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 25:**

17 During the period from March 5, 2014 to the present, FXG did not authorize meal periods for  
18 pick-up and delivery drivers employed by Independent Service Providers in California.

19 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 25:**

20 FedEx Ground objects to this request as stated in Objection Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Subject to,  
21 limited by, and without waiving such objections, FedEx Ground responds as follows:

22 **FedEx Ground admits that, during the Operative Period, it has not employed any**  
23 **pickup and delivery drivers that were employed by SPs in California. Accordingly, FedEx**  
24 **Ground has not undertaken any of the types of actions (such as establishing meal period**  
25 **schedules, publishing its own meal period policies and procedures, or providing training or**  
26 **instruction regarding meal periods) that FedEx Ground understands Plaintiffs contend would**  
27 **be examples of actions that may be necessary for an employer to comply with its obligations**  
28

1 under Section 512(a) of the California Labor Code and Section 11 of Wage Order No. 9-2001 of  
2 the California Industrial Welfare Commission.

3 The SPs that employed the drivers were, however, at all times during the Operative  
4 Period, required as stated in the SPs' written agreements with FedEx Ground, to comply with  
5 all California laws and regulations applicable to the SPs' employment of such drivers.  
6 Accordingly, FedEx Ground denies that the drivers were not provided with meal periods as  
7 required by California law.

8 Other than as expressly admitted above, FedEx Ground denies this request.

9 **OBJECTION:**

10 Federal Rules of Evidence 402 and 403. This request and response relate to this case as a  
11 putative class action before the Court's denial of certification. What FedEx Ground did or did not do  
12 with respect to all "pick-up and delivery drivers employed by Independent Service Providers in  
13 California" during the period 2014 to present is not relevant to any issue in this case. Also, Plaintiffs'  
14 use of the request and response would be unfairly prejudicial and confusing to jurors because it  
15 indicate this is a larger or class action, and it is not. Additionally, whether FedEx Ground itself  
16 "authorize[d] meal periods" for Service Providers' employees across the State of California is not  
17 relevant to Plaintiffs' proofs, and it is prejudicial and confusing because it puts before the jury an  
18 issue that is not pertinent to their decision (i.e., potential implications of FedEx Ground being a "bad  
19 actor" for not authorizing such breaks itself when the real question is whether Bay Rim authorized  
20 breaks for its drivers). This Court has thrice rejected Plaintiffs' proposal to prove meal and rest break  
21 violations based on FedEx Ground's conduct divorced from Service Providers' practices. (*See* Order  
22 Denying Mot. for Class Cert. 15-16, ECF No. 171; Order on Def. FedEx Ground Package Sys., Inc.'s  
23 Mot. to Strike 7-8, ECF No. 184; Order Granting Mot. to Strike PAGA Claim Asserted Against Def.  
24 FedEx Ground Package Sys., Inc. 4-5, ECF No. 201.)

25 **RESPONSE TO OBJECTION:**

26 If FedEx Ground is an employer, it must provide meal rest periods by relieving them of duty.  
27 IWC Wage Order 9(12). This admission makes clear that FedEx Ground did not do anything to  
28

1 comply with this obligation other than insert a clause in its standard ISP Agreement stating that ISPs  
2 should follow the law.

3  
4 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 26:**

5 During the period from March 5, 2014 to the present, FXG did not maintain any policy  
6 authorizing meal periods for pick-up and delivery drivers employed by Independent Service  
7 Providers in California.

8 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 26:**

9 FedEx Ground objects to this request as stated in Objection Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Subject to,  
10 limited by, and without waiving such objections, FedEx Ground responds as follows:

11 **FedEx Ground admits that, during the Operative Period, it has not employed any**  
12 **pickup and delivery drivers that were employed by SPs in California. Accordingly, FedEx**  
13 **Ground has not established or published meal period policies of its own that applied to drivers.**

14 **The SPs that employed the drivers were, however, at all times during the Operative**  
15 **Period, required as stated in the SPs' written agreements with FedEx Ground, to comply with**  
16 **all California laws and regulations applicable to the SPs' employment of such drivers.**  
17 **Accordingly, FedEx Ground denies that the drivers were not provided with meal periods as**  
18 **required by California law.**

19 **Other than as expressly admitted above, FedEx Ground denies this request.**

20 **OBJECTION:**

21 Federal Rules of Evidence 402 and 403. This request and response relate to this case as a  
22 putative class action before the Court's denial of certification. What FedEx Ground did or did not do  
23 with respect to all "pick-up and delivery drivers employed by Independent Service Providers in  
24 California" during the period 2014 to present is not relevant to any issue in this case. Also, Plaintiffs'  
25 use of the request and response would be unfairly prejudicial and confusing to jurors because it  
26 indicate this is a larger or class action, and it is not. Additionally, whether FedEx Ground itself did  
27 not "maintain any policy authorizing meal periods" for Service Providers' employees across the State  
28 of California is not relevant to Plaintiffs' proofs, and it is prejudicial and confusing because it puts



1 before the jury an issue that is not pertinent to their decision (i.e., potential implications of FedEx  
2 Ground being a “bad actor” for not authorizing such breaks itself when the real question is whether  
3 Bay Rim authorized breaks for its drivers). This Court has thrice rejected Plaintiffs’ proposal to prove  
4 meal and rest break violations based on FedEx Ground’s conduct divorced from Service Providers’  
5 practices. (See Order Denying Mot. for Class Cert. 15-16, ECF No. 171; Order on Def. FedEx  
6 Ground Package Sys., Inc.’s Mot. to Strike 7-8, ECF No. 184; Order Granting Mot. to Strike PAGA  
7 Claim Asserted Against Def. FedEx Ground Package Sys., Inc. 4-5, ECF No. 201.)

8 **RESPONSE TO OBJECTION:**

9 If FedEx Ground is an employer, it must provide meal rest periods by relieving them of duty.  
10 IWC Wage Order 9(12). This admission makes clear that FedEx Ground did not do anything to  
11 comply with this obligation other than insert a clause in its standard ISP Agreement stating that ISPs  
12 should follow the law.

13  
14 Respectfully submitted,

15 Dated: September 19, 2022

aiman-smith & marcy

16  
17 \_\_\_\_\_/s/ Joseph Clapp\_\_\_\_\_  
18 Joseph Clapp, Esq.  
19 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28